

Remarks

This REQUEST FOR CONTINUED EXAMINATION and REPLY is in reply to the Office Action mailed November 1, 2007. A Petition for Extension of Time is submitted herewith, together with the appropriate fee. No fee is due for the addition of new claims.

I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Prior to the Office Action mailed November 1, 2007, Claims 50-70 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, the Specification was objected for various informalities. Claims 50-70 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, as being indefinite. Claims 64-70 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 50, 57 and 64 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Muller ("Event-Oriented Dynamic Adaptation of Workflows, Model, Architecture, and Implementation", 2002). Claims 51-56, 58-63 and 65-70 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Muller, in view of Peltz, ("Web Service Orchestration", HP, 1-2003).

II. Summary of Applicant's Amendment

The present Reply amends Claims 50-52, 54-59 and 61-63; cancels Claims 64-70; and adds new Claims 71-75, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 50-63 and 71-75.

III. Specification

In the Office Action mailed November 1, 2007, the Specification was objected to for various informalities. Accordingly, the Specification has been amended as shown above. Applicant respectfully submits that the proposed amendments correct informalities in the Specification and that no new matter is being added. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

IV. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

In the Office Action mailed November 1, 2007, Claims 50-70 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention, particularly for the use of trademarks such as "Java".

Accordingly, Claims 50-52, 54-59 and 61-63 have been amended, and Claims 64-70 have been canceled, all as shown above. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 50-63 as amended conform to the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

V. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101

In the Office Action mailed November 1, 2007, Claims 64-70 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Accordingly, Claims 64-70 have been canceled, rendering moot the rejection of these claims. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to prosecute any canceled claims in a continuing or future application.

VI. Claims Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(a)

In the Office Action mailed November 1, 2007, Claims 50, 57 and 64 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Muller ("Event-Oriented Dynamic Adaptation of Workflows, Model, Architecture, and Implementation", 2002).

Claim 50

Claim 50 has been amended by the current Response to more clearly define the embodiment therein. As amended, Claim 50 defines:

50. *(Currently Amended) A system for utilizing a workflow language, comprising:*
a computer including a processing device operating thereon;
a program source file stored on a computer readable medium, wherein the program source file includes a source code and classes therein and a workflow definition created using a workflow language that is specified in the form of annotations to the source code and the classes, and wherein said workflow language extends the source code with a plurality of workflow constructs, including constructs for defining parallel processing of a workflow and separate workflow branches therein, and wherein the workflow definition further includes a construct to terminate the parallel processing of the workflow when certain conditions are met; and
means for creating a workflow program according to said workflow definition, including

means for the computer to read the source file and process the plurality of workflow constructs to activate a workflow, including creating separate workflow processes corresponding to the separate workflow branches,

means for activating each of the separate workflow processes to subsequently generate activities at the computer as defined by each workflow branch, and

means for determining when the certain conditions specified in the source file have occurred and then terminating the parallel processing of the workflow.

Claim 50 has been amended to more clearly define the embodiment therein as comprising a program source file stored on a computer readable medium, wherein the program source file includes a source code and classes therein and a workflow definition created using a workflow language that is specified in the form of annotations to the source code and the classes, and wherein said workflow language extends the source code with a plurality of workflow constructs, including constructs for defining parallel processing of a workflow and separate workflow branches therein, and wherein the workflow definition further includes a construct to terminate the parallel processing of the workflow when certain conditions are met.

Muller discloses a system for event-oriented dynamic adaptation of workflows. As disclosed therein the AGENTWORK system supports the definition, the execution and, as its main contribution, the event-oriented and semi-automated dynamic adaptation of workflows. (Page 1). Typical workflow definition tools allow to define workflows with a graph-based language (such as the one shown in Figure 1-1). Figure 1-2 shows a simplified architecture of a workflow management system. Typical workflow definition tools allow to define workflows with a graph-based language (such as the one shown in Figure 1-1). Sometimes also a verification component is provided to avoid incomplete or inconsistent workflow definitions. The workflow engine instantiates workflows from workflow definitions, and decides which activities of the workflow have to be executed next. (Page 4). A workflow definition can be viewed as some sort of a high-level program where the activities form the different program "operations", and where edges and control flow nodes specify the program's control and data flow. Thus, it makes sense to inspect whether programming languages contribute to the problem of handling control flow failures. In this context [Muller] concentrate on procedural languages (e.g., C++, JAVA) as these languages are characterized by an explicit control flow notion. (Page 28). Workflow activities are

represented by so-called activity nodes. To an activity node, a so-called activity definition has to be assigned specifying which activity has to be executed when the activity node is reached. (Page 55).

Applicant respectfully submits that, as described above, Muller appears to describe a workflow definition which is defined by a high-level program, and which in turn references other application programs that are then executed by the workflow engine. As such, Muller discloses that workflows can be defined as a graph-based language (i.e., represented as a graph). However, Muller does not appear to disclose or suggest that a workflow definition file can be created using a workflow language in the form of an annotation to the source code of a program.

Claim 50 has been amended to more clearly define that, in the embodiment therein, the program source file includes *a source code and classes* therein and a workflow definition created using a workflow language that is *specified in the form of annotations to the source code and the classes*, and wherein said *workflow language extends the source code with a plurality of workflow constructs*, including constructs for defining parallel processing of a workflow and separate workflow branches. Applicant respectfully submits that these features are neither disclosed nor suggested by Muller.

In view of the comments provided above, Applicant respectfully submits that the embodiment defined by Claim 50 is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 57 and 64

The comments provided above with respect to Claim 50 are hereby incorporated by reference. Claim 64 has been canceled, rendering moot the rejection of this claim. Claim 57 has been similarly amended to Claim 50 to more clearly define the embodiment therein. For similar reasons as provided above with respect to Claim 50, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 57, as amended, is likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

VII. Claims Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In the Office Action mailed November 1, 2007, Claims 51-56, 58-63 and 65-70 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Muller, ("Event-Oriented Dynamic Adaptation of Workflows, Model, Architecture, and Implementation", 2002) in view of Peltz, ("Web Service Orchestration", HP, 1-2003).

Claims 51-56, 58-63 and 65-70

Claims 65-70 have been canceled, rendering moot the rejection of these claims. Claims 51-56 and 58-63 depend from and include all of the features of either Claim 50 or Claim 57 respectively. These claims have also been amended by the current Response to more clearly define the embodiments therein. Claims 51-56 and 58-63 are not addressed separately but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the amendments to the independent claims and the comments provided above. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 51-56 and 58-63 are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

VIII. Additional Amendments

Claims 71-75 have been newly added by the present Reply to define additional embodiments and features. Applicant respectfully requests that new Claims 71-75 be included in the Application and considered therewith.

IX. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

Application No.: 10/784,375
Reply to Office Action dated: November 1, 2007
Reply dated:

Enclosed is a PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for extending the time to respond up to and including March 3, 2008.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 3, 2008

By: /Karl F. Kenna/

Karl Kenna
Reg. No. 45,445

Customer No.: 23910
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800